THEOLOGY

VOL. LI JUNE, 1948 NO. 336

What is Anglicanism?—I

IT has been alleged that some years ago, at an interdenominational conference of theologians held at Bishopthorpe, the Anglican position was best represented by a well-known professor who is a Congregationalist. That report may be apocryphal, but it raises the question: What *is* the Anglican position? My purpose in this paper is—I will not say to supply but—to hint at the true answer to that question. But a good deal of introduction will be necessary in order that we may understand how it comes about that in 1948, about 400 years after the Reformation, many Anglicans find themselves asking this question without being able to frame the answer clearly, and perhaps with considerable anxiety about what the answer may be, or even whether there is an answer at all.

I ought to say at once that I am going to consider the question in the setting of the Church of England, rather than of the Anglican Communion as a whole. I do this not because I suppose that the Church of England is the purest part, or the most satisfactory specimen, of the Anglican churches, for I hold that in some respects that is far from being the case. I shall speak of the Church of England rather than of the Anglican Communion, because I know the Church of England best, and also because the problem with which I am concerned is a pressing problem here, whatever may be the case elsewhere.

Even those whose knowledge of the Church of England is most remote have some idea that its characteristics are both peculiar and elusive. He is a bold man who attempts to say precisely what Anglicanism is. And, as a matter of fact, part of what I want to say might be expressed in the assertion that there is no such thing as Anglicanism, though I shall reach a more positive conclusion than that.

There are those who suppose that the peculiar characteristics of the Church of England are the result of the Elizabethan settlement and that their maintenance depends on the continuation of the establishment in England. No doubt it is impossible to explain the character of the Church of England, and also of the Anglican Communion, without reference to the Elizabethan settlement; but the notion that the Anglican character now depends on the English establishment is manifestly absurd, since the establishment subsists in England alone, whereas the Anglican Communion has a more or less similar character in all parts of the world. Nowhere, moreover, has the termination of establishment resulted in a dissolution of the Church into what are alleged to be its constituent and inconsistent parts.

At the same time I want to acknowledge a fact which has not yet received the consideration that it deserves, and sooner or later will require. Post-Reformation Anglican theology developed on the basis of the assumption that the Church of England was a National Church

—that it was the visible Church of Christ in England. As such it claimed to be a pure and reformed part of the Church Universal. It recognized that there were National Churches in other lands, some reformed, some unreformed, but it never supposed that there could be a number of true churches in one land. In England, at all events, those bodies of Christians that were separated from the National Church were deemed to be schismatic sects, whether they were Romish or Protestant dissenters. This claim to be the one true Church of the nation may still be made with a measure of plausibility in England itself, though it is seldom if ever now *consistently* made. It was in fact becoming hard to sustain even a hundred years ago.

> A citizen of a large town (wrote James Martineau in 1850) can wander every Sunday into the chapel to hear mass, or into the Friends' meeting-house to keep silence, or into the Wesleyan, or Independent, or Unitarian chapel, to hear in each a different doctrine of nature and of grace, expounded perhaps in a manner quite as edifying as the rector's. How can you persuade that man that Christ has only one church in England?—that the rector is distinguished from all these people, as a divine messenger from a set of impostors?—that he is appointed to open and shut the heavenly kingdom, while they are set for a delusion and a snare?[1]

It was certainly difficult to sustain such a claim then, and it is much more difficult now. And in most of the countries where there are now churches in communion with Canterbury the claim cannot even be made to look plausible. In 1865 Bishop Atkinson of North Carolina spoke of the claim of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. "to be a pure and vigorous branch of the Church Catholic," adding the hope that it would rise continually "into wider usefulness and higher influence, until at length it shall become the Church, not merely in the United States, but of the American people."[2] I suppose no churchman in America who weighed his words, then or now, would venture to say more than that.

It has come about that most Anglicans in England and elsewhere, without realizing what a difference the change makes, now think not in terms of National Churches, of which the Church of England is one, but of world denominations, of which the Anglican Communion is one. The change has come about partly as a result of the missionary expansion of the last 150 years, which has carried the Anglican Communion into countries where a claim to be *the* National Church, if it were plainly asserted, would seem preposterous. The long movement towards toleration also led to the gradual replacement of seventeenth-century conceptions of exclusive or inclusive National Churches by quite different conceptions of churches as international denominations, and of the Universal Church as a collection of denominations instead of as embodied in National Churches. It is obvious that we cannot simply resuscitate seventeenth-century conditions and conceptions. I will only say here that a multiplicity of National Churches is much more in accord with the Biblical doctrine of the Church than a multiplicity of world sects.

[1] Martineau, *Miscellanies* (1852), p. 306.
[2] See J. B. Cheshire, *The Church in the Confederate States* (1912), p. 219.

The earlier Anglican divines set themselves to show that the Church of England, as it emerged from the upheavals of the Reformation period, was a true Church. They had to meet assaults from opposite sides—from Rome and from Geneva, from papists and from puritans. Their method was not to develop a comprehensive system of doctrine, but to defend the comprehensive church order which they had providentially inherited, to defend it on the grounds of its accord with Scripture, primitive antiquity or tradition, and sound reason. The great works of Anglican divinity, such as Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* or Butler's *Analogy*, have been evoked by a contemporary need or challenge, have been written *ad hoc* if not *ad hominem*, and it may be said that to this extent at least the characteristic method of Anglican divinity is biblical. No doubt we have had some divines who have tried to build theological systems, but they have not been highly esteemed and they are little remembered. Dr Pusey in 1830 wrote to a German correspondent as follows:

> You will doubtless have observed that few, if any, of our writings have originated in an abstract love of investigation; our greatest and some immortal works have arisen in some exigencies of the times; the writings of Chillingworth, Hooker, Butler, Bull (and so of the rest) were written not merely to solve problems of importance in themselves, but such as the good of the Church in our country at that time required.[1]

There is no work that has played a part in our divinity corresponding to the parts played elsewhere by Calvin's *Institutes* or the *Summa* of St Thomas.

Nor have Anglicans regarded this fact as a deficiency or as a matter for apology (unless it be in quite recent times). We found that we had all that was needed for the practical purposes of a living Church in the Bible, the Creeds and the Book of Common Prayer. And until the nineteenth century we had as well a traditional body of divinity which was generally read and studied. I do not wish to suggest that the average parson in the eighteenth century spent two or three hours a day in reading our standard divines. I suspect that there was much truth then, as there is now, in an observation which Hugh James Rose made to Newman in 1836: "I consider the English as an eminently anti-reading nation, and . . . of course the clergy partake of this character."[2] Still, it is true that until the nineteenth century Anglicans had common ground, since in so far as we read at all we read the same authors, although we treated no single author as authoritative in the way that Lutherans treat Luther. It did not occur to anyone to formulate, let alone to answer, the question: What is Anglicanism? We knew well enough our tradition and our direction, and felt no need to encase our faith or our church in an elaborate system of doctrine. According to the Oxford English Dictionary the earliest use of the word "Anglicanism" is in 1846,[3] whereas the word "Presbyterianism" dates from the seventeenth century, and that is significant.

---

[1] See Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, i, 238.
[2] See Burgon's *Lives of Twelve Good Men* (1888), i, 209.
[3] The word *anglicanisme* occurs in Lamennais' *Essai sur l'indifférence* (1817), i, 158.

Various circumstances within and without the Church of England, which I will specify, have, however, made the question, "What is Anglicanism?" almost a burning one in some circles to-day.[1] First, the development in the Church of England of at least three organized parties, each of which has seemed to stand for a different system of doctrine. It is true that previously there were different schools of thought in the Church, as indeed there always will be in any Christian body that is more than a sect. But up till the nineteenth century High Churchmen, Latitudinarians, etc., all regarded their primary allegiance as being due to the Church of England itself, and not to a party. What distinguished them was a particular emphasis in their interpretation of the teaching of the Church, or divergent pastoral methods, or a particular political affiliation. In any case, there was no question of the party *organizations* with which we have since become familiar. By the end of the nineteenth century, however, it came about that there were many loud-voiced members of the Church who regarded themselves primarily as adherents of Evangelicalism or Anglo-Catholicism or Broad Churchmanship, who were almost accidentally, or at least secondarily, members of the Church of England. It became apparent that the parties stood for different systems and incompatible systems, and therefore the question arose: What does the Church of England stand for? Is it anything more than a device for keeping in uneasy juxtaposition a number of sects, parties or systems that do not really belong together? At a time when party hostility in the Church was at its height, James Martineau put the case in these vigorous terms:

> The Act of Uniformity (which, of course, includes the Prayer Book), it is now confessed, enforces a heterogeneous congeries of theological propositions with no organic unity, held together by no higher bond than the printer's frame of types, and incapable of coexisting in any mind of logical grasp and moral earnestness to use it; and the only uniformity which it secures among the clergy, beyond the weekly monotony upon the ear, is that of invariable self-contradiction, of partial unveracity, and bitter mutual aversions.[2]

This, then, is one circumstance that has led many of us to ask with considerable anxiety: What is Anglicanism?

(Before I continue I would remark that the picture of the Church of England as a congeries of warring sects has in point of fact always been misleading. While the Church as a whole has not been unaffected or uninfluenced by the various parties that have been formed within it, there has been a solid and central mass of Anglicans who have never been in any of the parties, but who have maintained the unhyphenated allegiance to the Church of England itself which was traditional with their forefathers. This is probably true of a large majority of the clergy, and certainly of the bulk of the laity. I do not know that these are much worried to-day by the question: What

[1] Some of the points in the following paragraphs I have already made in an abbreviated form in my Hale Lectures. See *Witness to the Light* (1948), chap. viii. An English edition, entitled *The Theology of F. D. Maurice*, will be published by the S.C.M. Press.

[2] *Miscellanies*, p. 414.

is Anglicanism? It is rather the unsettled remainders of the parties that are now in their decadence who are agitated by this question.)

A second general circumstance that has prompted the question is a result of the disintegrating effects of what is called modern thought upon all traditional theology. As I have said, until the last century Anglicans were accustomed to read the works of their standard divines in so far as they were accustomed to read any divinity at all, and this gave them a common universe of discourse and theological perspective.[1] This was true of the educated laity as well as of the clergy. I recently purchased in a second-hand book shop an abridgment of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, published in 1773, "*adapted to the use of families*," as the title-page says. But during the Liberal period it came to be supposed that seventeenth- and eighteenth-century divinity, and indeed any divinity more than a generation old, must be obsolete. Gradually the custom of reading our standard divines died out. I believe that in most English dioceses (I know of only one exception) Hooker finally disappeared from the syllabus of reading required from candidates for ordination about twenty years ago; some years before, Paley had been at last retired from little-go at Cambridge.

I fear it may now be the case that only a small proportion of our clergy has read any divinity to speak of that was published before the beginning of this century. And our twentieth-century divines have themselves been for the most part individual essayists rather than reinterpreters of a theological tradition in which they had deep roots. It may appear that Oxford philosphical idealism or historical positivism rather than the Bible and the Prayer Book has provided the ground and determined the method of their teaching, though the fact that they were still tied to the use of the Bible and the Prayer Book prevented their departure from Scripture and tradition from being as manifest, or indeed as real, as otherwise would have been the case. Too many present-day Anglicans might be described by some words which I came across in the Journals of Caroline Fox. Caroline mentions a visit which she paid to a Moravian lady named Schimmelpenninck, whom she thus describes: "She is a very genial person, so alive to the beauty of all Religious Faith, however widely diverse. She spoke of having suffered from an indiscriminate theological education." Anyhow, this severance from traditional moorings, in a period of inevitable intellectual upheaval, is a second circumstance which has led our theological students to ask with particular, and sometimes poignant, anxiety: What is Anglicanism?

But even if this inquiry had not been pressed upon us by the internal condition of Anglican theology it would have been pressed upon us by the general theological environment of the present time, and this constitutes a third circumstance. The easy-going confidence which most of us had in a more or less liberal and eclectic theology was first surprised and then shaken when we learned that in Germany, which used to be the spearhead of liberalism, and elsewhere on the Continent

[1] For a remarkable example of a course of reading undertaken by a young clergyman early in the nineteenth century, see W. R. W. Stephens' *Life and Letters of Dean Hook* (1878), pp. 64*f*.

a violent reaction had occurred. A little later we learned that the churches on the Continent were being driven to make a confessional stand and that they were again taking very seriously their traditional standards. It appeared that the Lutherans and Calvinists, about whom we knew very little, as well as the Romanists, about whom we knew a good deal, were discovering in their respective traditions theological resources which enabled them to make declarations of principle on the basis of which their resistance to totalitarianism and other forms of modern infidelity rested. Anglicans have been beginning to wonder whether they have any corresponding traditional resources upon which they will be able to call in the struggle that may be impending for them too, and upon which they ought perhaps to be calling already. You can see that this gives further point to the question: What is Anglicanism?

Another circumstance, connected with but distinct from that which I have just mentioned, arises from the intellectual confusion, not to say chaos, of the age, which causes those who become aware of it and anxious to get out of it or over it to look for some definite, dogmatic and forthright faith, for some systematic framework for thought and action from within which they can at any rate achieve a consistent criticism of other people, even if they cannot construct much themselves. Here we have to admit that the Romanists in the Thomist or neo-Thomist system and the neo-orthodox Protestants in what is roughly called Barthianism seem at first sight to have the advantage of us. We have nothing to offer so massive, so compact or so definite. It is therefore not surprising that some of our brightest and perhaps best young divines have been resorting to one or other, and occasionally both, of those schools and attempting to develop an Anglican version of neo-Thomism or of neo-Calvinism. Both projects can be represented as a resumption of the right and original course of Anglican divinity, since our early divines, Hooker *par excellence*, were greatly indebted to and influenced by both St Thomas and Calvin. A partisan theologian with some skill and little scrupulousness can so emphasize and isolate the Catholic or Protestant strain in Anglican divinity, and ignore what is inconvenient for his thesis, as to make its characteristic tradition appear to be either purely Catholic or purely Protestant. Few of us now, as I have indicated, are sufficiently acquainted with the whole corpus of our traditional divinity readily to check these brave and ingenious essays; and the truth is further obscured by the way in which our formularies have been industriously glossed by one school and another. But we may have a shrewd suspicion that these essays are *tours de force*, and that the gist of the matter is being left out. They are really marginal manœuvres which may serve to direct attention to, as well as to divert attention from, the main battle front: by which I mean the real question which the existence of the Church of England imposes on its own members and brings before Christendom in a tangible and practical, not merely a theoretical, form.

A. R. Vidler.

(To be concluded)

The Development of the Lambeth Conference

After a lapse of eighteen years Lambeth Conference has been called to meet again in July and August of this year. Considering all that has happened since it last met in 1930 and the present world situation it will surely prove a momentous meeting. The conference has become so well established an institution that it is difficult to realize that it is not as ancient as the English Church itself, that it dates back only to the year 1867, and that only seven meetings have been held.

Lambeth Conference is an indirect outcome of the case of Bishop Colenso. The publication of his books on the Penteteuch led to the Metropolitan of South Africa—the redoubtable Bishop Robert Gray, Bishop of Cape Town—taking measures to eject him from the See of Natal. Gray summoned the heretical bishop to appear before him, and on Colenso refusing to come he held a solemn court, examined the impugned books and, with two other bishops supporting him, passed a sentence of condemnation and deposition. Dr Colenso appealed to the Crown, and the judicial committee of the Privy Council declared that the letters patent of both the Bishops of Cape Town and Natal were null and void, owing to the fact of their having been issued after the South African Colonies had become self-governing, and therefore that the sentence of one bishop on another was null and void. Bishop Colenso treated the deposition with contempt and continued in his diocese. Bishop Gray proceeded then solemnly to excommunicate him and to seek for a new bishop from England. After all sorts of obstacles had been encountered the Rev. W. K. Macrorie was eventually consecrated in 1869, with the title of Bishop of Maritzburg, from the chief city of the colony of Natal.

Meanwhile vehement controversies arose in England between those who condemned the so-called heresies of Bishop Colenso on the one hand and those who disapproved of the action of Bishop Gray in presuming to depose and even excommunicate a brother bishop on the other.

The first Lambeth Conference arose from the interest awakened in North America by the Church affairs of South Africa. At the Provincial Synod of the Canadian Church held on September 20, 1865, it was unanimously agreed, on the motion of the Bishop of Ontario, to urge upon the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Convocation of his Province that means should be adopted "by which the members of our Communion in all quarters of the world should have a share in the deliberations for her welfare, and be permitted to have representation on one General Council of her members gathered from every land."

There can be little doubt that many of those who supported this appeal had visions of a central council with legislative powers, which would be able to co-ordinate the synods in every part and impose its will upon the several provinces of the Church. But Archbishop Longley, then in the seat of St Augustine, was a wise man, and he

took pains to make it clear that the conference which he, on the advice of his convocation, was prevailed upon to call was not a legislative assembly, but merely a conference of bishops from all parts of the world for fraternal discussion of their many common problems. This character the conference has maintained down to the present time, and any attempt to raise the conference to the position of a central council of our Church would be stoutly resisted by the main body of Anglicans everywhere.

Not all of the bishops were easy in their minds about the holding of the conference, and some of them, including the Archbishop and bishops of the Province of York, protested vigorously and declined the invitation to attend; but the Archbishop felt that he had a large enough majority in favour of such a conference and decided to proceed with the arrangements. Speaking generally, those who refused were Bishop Colenso's sympathizers, who feared that the conference might take some action in support of Bishop Gray.

The heat of the controversy which arose about the holding of the first Lambeth Conference may be judged from the refusal of Dean Stanley to allow the concluding service to be held in the Abbey Church of St Peter, Westminster, of which he was then the Dean, though the request came to him from the Archbishop of Canterbury and was conveyed to him by the Bishop of London. His action in so doing did not enhance his reputation, as the following quotation from a letter to him from the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. (Bishop Hopkins of Vermont) will testify: "You are indeed the Dean and so far the guardian of the edifice, but I do not comprehend how this can discharge the vows of ordination which bound you to obey your Bishop and Archbishop and follow with a glad mind their Godly admonitions. Nor do I perceive on what ground of ecclesiastical law you thought fit to take a course directly contrary to what you knew to be their design in holding this important conference of bishops from every quarter of the world. . . . Was it not enough to be assured that an assembly called by your own Archbishop and consisting of the bishops of the Church could not possibly be supposed to have any object, or arrive at any issue, inconsistent with truth and duty? Could not the Dean of Westminster trust 76 prelates of the Church with the care of her sacred interests? Or was he really justified in regarding them as a band of conspirators against her honour and dignity, so that he was conscientiously compelled, in despite of all real canonical principle, to shut the Abbey doors against them? This, my dear Sir, is the position in which your strange course has placed you in my humble judgment; you will pardon me, I trust, for speaking plainly." And so on, and so on.

It is only fair to Stanley to say that the request came to him before the conference met, and that he declined the request before he had any idea what course the conference would be likely to take. He was afraid of two things: (1) That the conference might condemn Bishop Colenso, with whom he sympathized, and (2) that the conference might set itself up as a central legislative council for the whole

communion. It is possible that, could he have foreseen the course the conference would take, he would have been ready to accede to the Archbishop's request. For, though the conference spent much time in discussing the case of Natal and its bishop and passed a resolution deploring the sad condition brought about by the dispute, yet it took no drastic action in the matter. It merely appointed a committee to go into the matter more fully and to report later. Here we see the chief justification for the holding of the conference. Most of the bishops attending came hoping that some action would be taken; yet the united wisdom of the whole body, guided surely by the ever-present Spirit of God, saved the conference from doing that which might have worked irreparable damage to our Communion and to the whole Church of God.

An important action taken by that first conference was the issuing of an address to the Faithful, two paragraphs of which I may quote. It is addressed "To the Faithful in Christ Jesus, the Priests and Deacons and the Lay Members of the Church of Christ in Communion with the Anglican Branch of the Church Catholic," and the letter includes the following exhortations: "Furthermore, we entreat you to guard yourselves and yours against the growing superstitions and additions with which in these latter days the truth of God hath been overlaid; as otherwise, so especially by the pretension to universal sovereignty over God's heritage asserted for the See of Rome, and by the practical exaltation of the Blessed Virgin Mary as mediator in the place of her Divine Son, and by the addressing of prayers to her as intercessor between God and man. Of such beware, we beseech you, knowing that the jealous God giveth not His honour to another."

"Build yourselves up therefore, beloved, in your most holy faith; grow in grace and in the knowledge and love of Jesus Christ our Lord. Show forth before all men by your faith, self-denial, purity and godly conversation, as well as by your labours for the people amongst whom God hath so widely spread you, and by the setting forth of His Gospel to the unbelievers and the heathen, that ye are indeed the servants of Him who died for us to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world."

The conference took no definite action about a future meeting, but the last resolution (No. XIII) expressed the hope "that this our meeting may be followed by other meetings to be conducted in the same spirit of brotherly love."

The inquiry soon became common: "Will there be a second conference? And, if so, when?" Once again it was the Canadian Church which took the initiative by a letter sent to the Convocation of Canterbury, asking it to support their appeal to the Archbishop to call another conference. This letter was written in 1872, only five years after the first conference. By common consent the matter was postponed for a time, but the second conference was called for 1878 and met in July of that year.

This may be a convenient place for giving a conspectus, as it were, of the seven Lambeth Conferences:

	Bishops invited	*Bishops attending*	*From Colonies and Missions*	*From U.S.A.*
1867	144	76	24	19
1878	173	100	30	19
1888	211	145	53	29
1897	240	194	70	49
1908	No record	242	89	55
1920	368	252	103	55
1930	No record	308	132	61

A study of these figures reveals two things, namely, the rapid expansion of the Anglican Communion and the growing recognition of the value of the conference.

I propose now to mention very briefly some of the outstanding points of each of the seven conferences.

(1) The first conference was very brief, lasting only from September 24 to 28, 1867. And the principal matter dealt with was the South African controversy. Enough has been said about this. From the Address to the Faithful it will be seen that in the five days the discussions covered a wide field, including the Roman controversy and the great subject of Christian unity.

(2) The second conference was a much longer one. It lasted from June 29 (St Peter's Day) to July 27, 1878. It met in a much calmer atmosphere under the presidency of Archbishop Tait. The subjects dealt with were all concerned with the unity of the rapidly expanding communion, *e.g.*: The best mode of maintaining union among the various churches of the Anglican Communion; The position of Anglican chaplains and chaplaincies on the Continent of Europe; The relations to each other of missionary bishops and missionaries in various branches of the Anglican Communion acting in the same country, and so forth.

(3) The president of the third conference, which met from June 30 to July 28, 1888, was Archbishop Benson. It is chiefly famous for the *Lambeth Quadrilateral*, which is contained in Resolution No. 11. The resolution sets out four points which taken together could, in the opinion of the conference form a basis upon which approach might, by God's blessing, be made towards the problem of Home Reunion: (1) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; (2) The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; (3) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ; and (4) The Historic Episcopate.

(4) The fourth conference was presided over by Archbishop Temple (father of the late Archbishop William Temple). It met on June 30 and adjourned August 1, 1897. It dealt with a great variety of subjects, including Religious Communities, Church Unity, the critical study of Holy Scripture, the Book of Common Prayer, international arbitration, industrial problems, and so forth. But by far the longest report and the largest number of resolutions are on the subject of foreign missions, and the needs of, and the problems connected with, the great missionary enterprise were very fully dealt with.

(5) Archbishop Davidson presided over two conferences—the fifth and the sixth. The fifth met from July 6 to August 6, 1908, and again

the questions discussed covered a very wide range. The Faith and modern thought, ministries of healing, marriage problems, the moral witness of the Church, reunion and intercommunion, are five out of a total of eleven subjects referred to committees for discussion and upon which the conference as a whole passed resolutions. This was the year of the Pan-Anglican Congress, the calling of which was at least partly inspired by the tremendous emphasis laid by the previous conference on overseas missionary work. The congress was immediately followed by the fifth Lambeth Conference. The encyclical letter to the whole Anglican Communion was a most stirring appeal for a spirit of self-sacrifice and consecrated service. This was followed up by a letter from the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, referring to the Pan-Anglican Congress and declaring that the Church at home could not dare to be disobedient to the vision which it had seen. Its life could not continue as if the great appeals of 1908 had not been heard. A door of special opportunity had been opened. "We are jealous for the honour of the Church of England, that it may be among the first messengers of Christ to enter in." Some time before the congress a letter was sent to every Province of the Communion, suggesting that a thankoffering fund should be raised from every member of the Communion, at home and abroad, for God's blessing vouchsafed on our Communion down the ages. The suggestion was warmly taken up, and a total sum of about £350,000 was contributed. This fund was offered to God at a great service in St Paul's Cathedral during the congress, and was afterwards distributed by a committee appointed for the purpose mainly among the overseas dioceses of the Anglican Communion.

(6) The first world war came between the fifth and sixth meetings, so that twelve instead of ten years elapsed between them. The sixth was held in 1920. It lasted from July 3 to August 8. This conference will ever be memorable for its decisions on the question of Christian Unity, and especially for its "Appeal to all Christian People." The language of the appeal is most moving, and anyone who was present can testify to the sincere desire and longing for a closer fellowship with all Christian people everywhere which pervaded the whole conference. Paragraph 6 of the appeal modifies somewhat and supersedes the Quadrilateral. It says: "We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance: (*a*) The Holy Scriptures as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith, and the creed commonly called Nicene as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the baptismal confession of belief. (*b*) The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ. (*c*) A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing, not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body." Had the appeal stopped there, unity, at least of the reformed branches of the Church, might have been in sight. But the seventh paragraph went on to say: "May we not rightly

claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a Ministry. . . . We submit that considerations alike of history and of present experience justify the claim that we make on behalf of the Episcopate." These words are not unreasonable when it is remembered that the unity aimed at was not merely the unity of the reformed branches of the Church, but of the whole Church throughout the world; moreover, they were expressed in a form which seemed to invite discussion of the whole subject. The Appeal produced no substantial result, but it did certainly clear the atmosphere and assure the brethren who are separated from us of our very sincere longing for a fuller unity.

(7) Archbishop Lang was president of the seventh meeting. It was held in 1930 in July and August. I shall only mention two points which seem to me to give special significance to this particular meeting. First, the report of the committee on the Christian Doctrine of God, of which the Irish Primate, Archbishop D'Arcy, was the chairman. One sentence from Resolution 3 (one of eight which deal with this subject) is worth quoting: "As Jesus Christ is the crown, so also is He the criterion of all revelation. We would impress upon Christian people the necessity of banishing from their minds ideas concerning the character of God which are inconsistent with the character of Jesus Christ." Secondly, Resolution 57 acknowledges the provincial organization attained in Japan and China, "whereby the Nippon Sei Kokwai and the Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui have become constituent churches of the Anglican Communion," and it welcomed the Japanese and Chinese bishops who, for the first time in the history of the Lambeth Conference, were present as bishops of those churches. These are the first two provinces to be formed that have no link with Britain, except through the missionary work of the home church.

It has been stated above that the Anglican Communion is a family of independent churches. It has no pope and no central council. The question naturally arises: What is it that binds this family together? There are certainly many centrifugal tendencies within it. Lambeth Conference is a help in maintaining the unity of the Communion, but none of the bishops regards the resolutions of that body as binding upon him. The real bond of union is in our order of worship—in other words, in the Book of Common Prayer, that wonderful treasury of the Church's devotion of which we are the guardians and trustees. It would be well if one of the findings of the second Lambeth Conference could be impressed afresh on every province and diocese of the Anglican Communion. The following is a quotation from it: "Remembering that the Book of Common Prayer, retained as it is with some modifications by all our churches, has been one principal bond of union between them, we desire to call attention to the fact that such communion in worship may be endangered by excessive diversities of ritual. We believe that the internal unity of the several churches will help greatly to the union of these one with another, and, while we consider that such large elasticity in the form of worship is desirable, as will give wide scope to all legitimate expression of devotional feeling, we would appeal, on

the other hand, to the Apostolic precept that 'all things be done unto edifying' and to the catholic principle that order and obedience, even at the sacrifice of personal preferences and tastes, lie at the foundation of Christian Unity and are even essential to the maintenance of the Faith."

JOHN HIND, *Bishop.*

Sources and quotations:
The Six Lambeth Conferences. Edited by the Bishop of Chichester.
The Report of the Seventh Lambeth Conference.
Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society*, Vol. I.
Prothero, *The Life of Dean Stanley.*

Mr Pawley and the Nonconformists

THE Rector of Elland's article, "Some Practical Difficulties of Reunion," raises issues which must not be allowed to drop. He is to be congratulated upon his courage in saying outright in public what many clergy say to each other in private. If his article inaugurates a new fashion of plain speaking about genuine difficulties, it will perform a great service to the true cause of reunion in this land. I should be the last to minimize the importance of discussion among theologians of different churches, but it has to be remembered that most theologians of repute in this country share a common academic background, and that this may be as relevant a factor in their discussion as their particular church affiliations. Mr Pawley is right in insisting that the parish priest and the local minister must be heard on this matter if real progress is to be made.

No honest Nonconformist will want to deny, either, that he is right in calling attention to the problem created for reunion by the weaknesses of the Nonconformist churches. It is interesting to compare Mr Pawley's attitude with that of the recent pamphlet on Co-operation with Nonconformists brought out by the Church Union, which very charitably assumes that the prevailing weakness and confusion of the Nonconformist churches are likely rapidly to pass away, and gives them credit for a degree of seriousness of purpose and theological definiteness they would be flattered to possess. There can be little doubt that all the chief Nonconformist bodies in this country are very much weaker in numbers, influence and witness than they were forty years ago. I am not sure, as I shall go on to explain, that Mr Pawley has given a true picture of our weakness, or that we are as weak as we were ten years ago; but that only qualifies and does not remove the fact itself. It is not merely that we are confused in doctrine and in order, and that we have no Prayer Book and no Articles to conceal our confusion. It is that we have become complacent and trivialized, so that it is hard to obtain serious discussion of theological issues in the councils of the Free Churches, while any suggestion that we should alter our ways is resented as implying that we are not already perfect. Many Nonconformists like to suppose that it is the Church of England, and not they, which is the obstacle in relation to reunion; but anyone who has really tried to make a Nonconformist church

move and make sacrifices and do some hard work about reunion knows how far from the truth that is.

What worries me about Mr Pawley's article, however, is that the conclusion he draws from the fact of our weakness is likely, not to help us, but to make us much weaker, and thus to make the prospect of reunion even more remote. When those Nonconformists, with whom, as I imagine, Mr Pawley would find that he has most in common, ask themselves how renewal can come to their churches, their answer is that their only hope lies in their becoming less and less the "Free Churches" and more and more parts of the true Church of God, bearing upon them the marks of true catholicity. Our definition of those marks might not be quite the same as Mr Pawley's, but they would probably be much nearer his than those which the "Free Churches" display at present. And when we ask ourselves how this might be achieved we conclude that it must be done in three ways. First, we must listen with a new seriousness and self-criticism to what God is saying to us out of the Scriptures and the history of His people. Secondly, we must identify ourselves more closely with the life of the semi-secularized society around us, in which we all live and for which we are all partly responsible to God. And thirdly, we must reopen conversation about God and His will for His people with other churches from which we have been long estranged, in particular those of our own nation and our own towns and villages. It is for these reasons rather than because of any enthusiasm for the idea of reunion in itself that we embrace the œcumenical movement so eagerly. The main task of this movement is not, as I understand it, to achieve at any price a more generalized form of re-labelling for existing ecclesiastical forces. It is a task of reformation and renewal, in which a penitent recognition that we are dependent upon and have much to learn from Christians of other traditions has an essential part. I cannot see much hope for the future of the Nonconformist churches if the Church of England takes the line advocated in Mr Pawley's paper, that of concentrating on putting her own house in order before having much dealings with them.

Perhaps I may be allowed to observe that I cannot see much hope for the Church of England either if such a policy is pursued. To assess the relative strengths of the various churches is invidious in the extreme. Appearances often deceive, and none of us will be judged of man. But if, as I should be inclined to agree, the Church of England is in a stronger and healthier position than the Nonconformist churches to-day, the difference is at best one of a very few degrees. The Church of England may have more shoots of new life in it, but it has also probably a great deal more dead wood. The tenacity of all ecclesiastical institutions after the life has departed from them is amazing, but a church which has endowments and a parson's freehold can put up a show of existence more easily than one which is dependent for its upkeep on the weekly contributions of the faithful. One of the reasons why the much-abused bishops are reputed to be so œcumenically minded may be, not that they are the nominees of a State which is determined to foist "National Christianity" on an unsuspecting

Church, but that they are in a better position to see the wood for the trees than some of their parochial clergy, and thus know how woefully weak the impact of their churches on this nation is, and how much of what Christian life there is in this country goes on outside the Established Church. To talk about the "prophetic inspiration" of Nonconformity in these days is, admittedly, silly. But it is hard to see how the Church of England will overcome the dangers of clericalism and learn how to use its laity and understand what preaching and systematic theology can mean unless it learns them from the Nonconformists. It is hard, too, to see how it can make much impression on most of the older industrial districts and many suburban areas of large towns until it comes to some kind of terms with us. Surely the very fact that, without any great strain or compromise of principle, most large-scale attempts at evangelization or corporate Christian action in secular society almost automatically become interdenominational indicates both how dependent in our weakness we are upon one another and how much we do in fact have in common.

To be frank, the impression Mr Pawley's article left with me was that he did not quite mean what he said when he allowed that it might be quite proper for the old folks to write to each other occasionally even now. I agree that the time is not ripe for betrothal and sympathize with his impatience with those who rather lightheartedly suggest that it is. A truer metaphor, however, would be that the Church of England and the Nonconformists are an already married couple who have been unable to live together and are now legally separated. It is not a matter of indifference whether they should come together or not. It is sinful for them to acquiesce in separation when they are man and wife, whoever may have been originally the guilty party. My suspicion is that Mr Pawley is not really anxious that there should be a true restoration of the family, which might involve awkward adjustments on his part, but would be only too glad of an excuse for a complete divorce. My reason for this suspicion is that he seems very readily disposed to cook the evidence against the Nonconformists. He could easily have found sufficient proof of the ill-health of our churches to indicate that it makes reunion more difficult. Why did he produce evidence so sweeping and misleading unless he is anxious to imply that it is impossible?

To take some examples of what I mean. There has been a serious enough breakdown of discipline among many of the Nonconformist churches in recent years, but the examples given are mere caricatures. In how many churches are subscriptions to the Anniversary or to the expenses of the annual performance of the "Messiah" allowed to stand as equivalent to the regular following of the Christian life? No doubt an occasional atrocity story can be adduced from here or there to lend substance to this charge, as they could from all churches, but is it right to take such instances as representative of the whole situation? Likewise, is it true to suggest that infant baptism is administered quite indiscriminatingly in these days? Many Nonconformist ministers teach a gravely attenuated doctrine of baptism—although the number who do is fewer than it was—but in most churches of my acquaintance

fairly careful inquiry is made into the Christian profession of the child's parents, who are more relevant than any godparents. Certainly much more care is exercised in our midst on this matter than appears to be customary in most Church of England or Roman Catholic churches. It is a new situation, indeed, in England if parents take their children to Methodist rather than to Anglican churches for baptism, because more awkward questions are asked in the latter than in the former. Apart from any doctrinal consideration, few families would be likely to approach the authorities of a Nonconformist church about the baptism of their children unless they already had a fairly close link with that church. The situation may be different in a few districts in the north, where the chapel may be so old-established as to have something of the position of a parish church, but such districts are relatively few.

Secondly, the comments of ex-ministers in Anglican orders may well be enlightening, but are they always necessarily reliable? A sympathetic critic might reasonably suppose that there would be a natural tendency on the part of such converts to exaggerate the deficiencies of the bodies they have forsaken, and anyway to be more familiar with the situation at the time they left rather than at the time of writing. Once again, much of what Mr Pawley says about the character of Nonconformist preaching is only too painfully true; but it is the eagerness of the overstatement which is disturbing, especially to anyone who has frequent opportunities of hearing sermons in the Church of England.

Thirdly, weak though we undoubtedly are, there is a suggestion of wishful thinking in the enthusiastic assertion that we are moribund. The evidence of the provincial priest on this matter is important, but it does not commend itself readily as reliable when statistics are adduced to prove the moribundity of the Nonconformist churches of an industrial area of Yorkshire based on what happens in them on Sunday mornings. An elementary knowledge of chapel-going habits in working-class districts should have made him realize that, however deplorably from his point of view, evening congregations are very much larger than morning congregations. Evidence of a much more intimate knowledge of the state of these churches may reasonably be demanded before the confident assertion that they are moribund can be accepted.

Fourthly, the references to children's work are puzzling in the extreme. It is encouraging to know that children's work in the Church of England in the last fifty years has been wondrously reformed. This makes the more surprising to Nonconformists, who in many of their churches have been at almost excessive pains to modernize and develop their Sunday schools with the aid of many paid experts, the statement that they are content to stand where the Church schools stood fifty years ago. Has Mr Pawley heard of the Family Church idea, officially sponsored and widely adopted by Nonconformist churches, which probably represents the most elaborate scheme yet devised for linking the Sunday school more closely to adult membership and to worship? Conditions vary, of course, from district to

district and church to church, but in view of the fact that almost 67 per cent. of the children of this country are still baptized in the Church of England and about 26 per cent. confirmed, it would be surprising if the proportion of children attending Nonconformist Sunday schools who later attain to full Church membership in them is lower than that of the Church of England, and it would have to be much lower to justify Mr Pawley's statement.

Baptists will be happy to know that, unlike the moribund Methodists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists, they are in a relatively healthy state, even though it means sharing the honours with the Roman Catholics and the Pentecostals. Once again, unworthy suspicion obtrudes itself that, in default of any concrete evidence provided, Mr Pawley is ready to allow prosperity to these bodies since there appears to be no immediate danger of embarrassing entanglements with them.

I have mentioned these misrepresentations in some detail because they illustrate, in a comparatively mild form, an attitude on the part of many Anglicans which is as great an obstacle to reunion conversations as any weakness among the Nonconformists, an attitude of what I can only describe as impatient arrogance, which assumes that Nonconformists are so unworthy of serious attention that even their errors need not be precisely defined. If it is not paradoxical for me to do so, may I respectfully suggest that a more pastoral and less contentious approach to us would be more appropriate to the attitude of the clergy of a church which claimed to be both national and catholic? Criticize us as hard as you like. We very badly need it. But do it on the basis of understanding and in the personal fellowship which gives it proportion and makes it acceptable. If the Nonconformist churches are weak to-day, it is not a matter of rejoicing among those who have the best interests of the Church of Christ in England at heart. Those who imagine that such weakness will mean that more than a tiny minority of people will drop gratefully into the arms of Anglicanism are woefully deceiving themselves. And sad though our plight may be, we are not so far gone that we are incapable of learning many of the lessons Anglicans most want us to learn if we are approached in the right way. If Mr Pawley were to reconsider the Nonconformist churches of his neighbourhood, I am confident that he would find in most of them, not excluding the seventy-two with less than a dozen present on Sunday morning, a rich fund of Christian loyalty and active charity and a few people who were eagerly ready to learn more about the true nature of the Gospel and the Church. Perhaps it is true that over-hasty talk of reunion schemes in high places has done much to confuse the issue. In most local situations, if not in all, we are far from that. But if, as the Rector of Wigan suggested in a recent number of THEOLOGY, the group which meets in the vicar's study could regularly meet and get to know and pray with the group which meets in the Methodist minister's study, nothing but good can come of it. I know that relations between the Church of England and Nonconformists in the past have been such that at the beginning Nonconformists are inclined to be a little touchy

and self-righteous. But if Anglicans allow for that and, without patronage and clerical self-assurance, begin by taking them as they are—Anniversaries and Wayside Pulpits and all—without being too horrified, they will find that most of them are almost excessively anxious for friendship. It is when such friendly contact is established that the way becomes open for them to learn and embrace for themselves many of the things which the Church of England can teach them and which they would be the better for knowing.

Perhaps it is appropriate in the pages of THEOLOGY to mention one other point. Mr Pawley's remarks about the Establishment disturbed me almost as much as the gusto with which he painted his picture of a decadent Nonconformity. It is true that all Nonconformists, and I among them, consider the present relation of the Church of England to the State indefensible, and that we are puzzled to know how a church in such a situation can be so emphatic on the importance of the apostolic succession of its ministry. But an increasing number of us are not prepared to echo the sentiments of Dr M. E. Aubrey, because we recognize that the question of the relation between Church and State in modern England is more complicated than he suggests that it is. We sympathize with the position of those Anglicans who insist that, in a society so centralized and highly organized as ours has become, a high doctrine of the State is as necessary as a high doctrine of the Church, and we recognize that one of the many defects of modern Nonconformity is that it has so far made very little contribution to that problem. It would be a pity if our belated recognition of the complexity of an issue about which we have been too complacent in the past should serve only to cast doubts on the sincerity of our aims.

DANIEL JENKINS.

The Alarming Difference[1]

PROBABLY few persons today remember Captain Kettle, supposing they were born long enough ago to make remembrance possible. He was a galvanic, resourceful and stubborn little ship's master, whose red beard was the emblem of a fiery temperament. As the hero of a long series of short stories by Cutcliffe-Hyne, he lived and had his being in the pages of the *Strand Magazine* at the same time as Sherlock Holmes was having his second incarnation there, even though he was never destined, like Holmes, for integration in English thought and language. If I resurrect Kettle for a moment, it is in order to draw attention to his unbounded confidence in the protective virtue of the Union Jack and to point out that this confidence would be impossible now.

Kettle was patriotic and even a bit of a jingo. He believed that Britain would go to war if any dago or tribesman as much as touched a hair of his head. No doubt that was a slight exaggeration, although early in this century France did in fact have a nice little colonial war

[1] This article is based on a talk to the Peterborough Parochial Clergy on January 5, 1948.

in Morocco to avenge the murder there of a single French major. Nevertheless, in those days, when most globe-trotters could not have told what a passport looked like, to be English or French—or, for that matter, Austrian, German or Italian—was for travellers a safeguard in itself. Actually, a Briton might settle abroad without any forfeit of the protection of his own government at home. Did he suffer by the expropriation of a business or landed estate, he could rely on the support of Downing Street in obtaining adequate compensation from the government of the country in which he was settled. Then the word "English" meant something, not only on the seas over which Britannia wielded her trident, but also in every foreign land. To-day that meaning of the word "English" abroad has gone. In quite a number of countries to-day the Englishman cannot expect his mere nationality to be a safe-conduct.

The reason is not that Britain has abdicated her position as a Great Power. The reason is that the word "English" has lost its moral standing. So, of course, have the words "French," "German," "Italian," "Russian," "Spanish," lost theirs. Fifty to sixty years ago the world at large accepted what is known as the law of nations, and it was this acceptance that made a man's nationality outside his own country a badge of respect. The *jus gentium* was never a *lex*, and the law of nations is not law as law is understood inside the territory of each independent sovereign state. That is to say, it has no warrant derived from sovereignty and sanctions. There is about it no compulsion, and one state can only enforce another's compliance with it at the price of violating it in turn. Hence the law of nations would be described more clearly as the rules of international morality. The fact that the rules are derived from Christian principles was no obstacle to their acceptance by Japan and by Islamic states when these, during the nineteenth century, entered into diplomatic and commercial relations with the West. In Captain Kettle's time every independent state, whatever the national religion, was anxious to observe the comity of nations, or, at worst, to be thought to do so. Now instead there is mutual intolerance between the nations and the novel pretence that injustice can be law. Thus it is that abroad the word "English" means little in comparison with what it meant once.

Simultaneously the meaning of the word has been debased at home. But a few years ago English workmanship was an example to the world, and the indication of origin, "Made in England," was a hall-mark of cheapness and quality. To-day the indication is as likely as not to stand for expensive shoddy. Certainly there are still plenty of English working men with an unobtrusive pride in the worthiness of whatever they have done. That is not to be denied for a moment. But now also there is a vast mass of English workers to whom it would seem never to have occurred that their nationality carries with it an obligation to give their work finish. It is not only making and producing that are done anyhow. A same blight rests on retail distribution, transport, and domestic service. The newspapers recently disclosed that the dirtiness and unpunctuality of our trains are not

due, as was thought, solely to the exigencies and hindrances of the late war, but above all to the irresponsibility and lack of interest rampant in the middle grades of railwaymen, among whom the motto, both as regards the performance of the duties they direct and as regards the performance of their own, might be "Don't care." Unfortunately such men are not alone. In many spheres of activity employers have ceased to expect the exercise of care and conscientiousness.

A corresponding decline has occurred in the standard of English manners. I do not say in the manners themselves, but in the standard. The decline can be measured by something that has happened to the notion of a gentleman. During the first war temporary officers in the Army were sometimes spoken of as "temporary gentlemen." I was then a temporary officer myself, and so I make no comment. But whatever may be thought of the term, it did clearly imply that a military officer was expected to behave like a gentleman. In the second war the expectation had so far dwindled as to have made the term "temporary gentleman" incomprehensible, and as far as I am aware it was never used. The other day the *Daily Telegraph* published letters complaining that Sandhurst should still aim at turning out gentlemen as well as officers. The significance of the complaint is obvious. When to be a gentleman was the ideal of every rung of the English social ladder down to the lower middle class—the English working man having standards of his own—it was commonly realized that to be English called for a certain quality in behaviour. To-day, speaking very generally, that is realized no longer.

Then there is the agitation to curtail English freedom of speech. As I write pressure is being exerted on the government to indict certain public speakers on a charge of seditious libel and conspiracy. There is talk of a parliamentary bill to make it a crime "to propagate, support, or encourage" certain doctrines or activities "in any part of the world." What the speakers must say in order to be prosecuted, what the doctrines or activities are—that is significantly not specified. The speakers, doctrines and activities are vaguely lumped together as "fascist." Now the only exact meaning of the word "fascist" is: member or doctrine of an Italian political party now annihilated and discredited. There was in England before the war, it is true, a body calling itself the British Union of Fascists; but it is only necessary to consult the new book[1] by its former leader, Sir Oswald Mosley, in order to see that his present political program—the promise in which is neither here nor there—cannot be labelled "fascist" with any scruple for precision. Of course he is, as Fascismo was, opposed to Communism; but then so are many others. In Russia, as we know, the word "fascist" is simply a pejorative term applied to any act or expression of opinion inside or outside Russia that is judged inimical to the Russian government and its policy. The agitators in favour of curtailing English freedom of speech would seem to be adopting this Russian usage. The danger hardly needs to be insisted upon. It is that whatever speakers, doctrines or activities are resented by an

[1] *The Alternative* (1947).

English government of the day shall be called "fascist," regardless of their real character, and thereupon legally repressed. That would be flatly at variance with English tradition.

The lapse in the English worker's attitude to his work, the deterioration of the standard of English manners, and the open proposals for an English betrayal of English legal tradition, are all evidences of a devaluation in the meaning of the word "English" at home. Other instances might be adduced. They would be superfluous. To have no conscience about the way a job is done, to honour no ideal of manners, to want to enlist law in the service of political advantage—all that is clearly immoral. At home as abroad the devaluation of the word "English" is a moral devaluation. At home as abroad what has occurred is a decline in the national morality.

The two declines, that at home and that abroad, are, I submit, connected. It is by our rulers and governors that the workers have been encouraged in an un-English slovenliness. I intend no attack on one political party. Between the policy of the government put into power in 1945 and that of its predecessor there is a continuity which the people now out of office find it convenient to ignore. Neither to-day nor yesterday, but for years, Whitehall has put a premium upon time given to wangling, queueing and scrounging over the time spent on honest work. As the financial editor of *The Times* remarked during the so-called fuel crisis of February, 1947, a policy that combines inflation of the currency with the rationing of goods must steadily reduce the rewards of ordinary paid work and of saving and promote the attractions of idleness, graft, black marketing, profiteering and stagnation. Likewise, from above has come the impulse to consign a standard of behaviour and conduct to desuetude. The egalitarian effects of a uniformity of war effort were incited to operate in terms of the lowest common denominator. If there is agitation to monkey with the indiscrimination of the law, it is our rulers and governors who first made the exercise of judicial power arbitrary by encroachments upon the prerogatives of both courts and Parliament. Administrative tribunals in great number are now set up by ministers to investigate and to decide questions, and legislation is in prospect to multiply them still further. Where such a tribunal simply abstains from decision, neither of the contesting parties has any remedy. No machinery exists to compel a ruling. Where a judicial decision has been given there is no possibility of appeal to a proper court of law. By order or by regulation a minister may now alter the provisions of a statute not a year old, and although his orders have to come before Parliament to be approved or rejected, Parliament is not entitled to amend them. There are now so many of these orders and regulations that the citizen cannot know all those that affect him. We may each break the law at least twice a day without suspecting it. Moreover, according to Mr D. N. Chester, writing recently in *Public Administration*, the government departments are losing efficiency through the sheer burden of ever-increasing administrative work. Even when known, decisions may appear to those affected by them a defiance of common sense. The result, Mr Chester says, is "a decline in the respect for

law." "Is one wrong in imagining," he asks, "that too frequent examples of wooden or foolish administration are causing more people than usual to place their own interpretation on what is legally right or wrong?"

The decline in morality at home has been, so to speak, a matter of national policy. As it is necessarily national policy also that has lowered morality in English international relations, the connexion between the two declines would appear unmistakable. Because they are connected the recent publication of a little book dealing with international morality seems to me to be an event of exceptional importance.[1] The author, Dr H. A. Smith, writes with authority. From 1928 to 1946 he was professor of international law in the University of London. His book is one of the keys we need to an understanding of our time.

According to him, it is in the present century and in the conduct of war that the morality of nations, in their attitude and relations to one another, entered upon a crisis, and now this crisis is world-wide. By the end of the nineteenth century the nations seemed to be moving in the opposite direction. It seemed as if the whole world had accepted the "single and logical body of legal rules" drawn up by Grotius for the conduct of international affairs by the numerous independent rulers who were exercising sovereignty in Western Europe at the time he published, in 1625, his treatise, *The Law of War and Peace*. As the title of the treatise shows, the rules were intended to apply to both peace and war. In 1899, and again in 1907, conferences held at The Hague sought to draw up codes for the conduct of warfare on sea and land, codes based on these rules of Grotius. As it turned out, the purpose of the conferences could not have been more deceptive. In 1915, eight years after the second of them, the Grotian rules for the conduct of war were discarded. In contravention of a new German maritime code, the German Navy began unrestricted submarine attacks. The Allies had resorted to a blockade. A new view of the nature and purpose of war had been adopted.

At this point Dr Smith's calm judicial language needs to be supplemented by the forthright vigour of Major-General J. F. C. Fuller. In the war of 1914-18 morality and common decency were, the latter says,[2] cast to the winds, and this, he adds, made that war fundamentally different from the Napoleonic and Franco-Prussian wars. In the second war, that of 1939-45, contempt of Grotius and of The Hague conferences was carried further. As Dr Smith says, prize courts became administrative organs of the maritime states, and prize law went by the board. General Fuller, referring to the exultation over atrocities perpetrated by one side and their execration when committed by the other side, and the trials of war criminals on the one hand, the massacres of Jews on the other, feels that these show that both during and after the war nations were mentally and morally unbalanced. It need hardly be pointed out that, if the Germans committed war crimes, so did the victors. In the United States

[1] H. A. Smith, D.C.L., *The Crisis in the Law of Nations*, Stevens and Sons, 7s. 6d.
[2] *Armament and History* (1946).

Strategic Bombing Survey, the strategic value of the so-called strategic bombing of Germany is put at nil. According to this survey, before 1943 the bombing of German towns was folly, for it invited potentially more serious retaliation without contributing to victory, and from 1943 till after the liberation of France it was criminal, for German war production was not diminished. Only after aerodromes had been sited on French soil did air attacks on Germany hamper the German war effort, and this was because they then had particular targets. The immorality in these circumstances speaks for itself. The dropping of atomic bombs on Japan, it has transpired, did nothing to hasten the end of the war with that country. The Japanese government had already seen that the struggle must be abandoned. In any event, that too was immoral. The insistence on unconditional surrender must be considered immoral, since, if war is the evil which it is said to be, morality must require that it shall not be prolonged a moment longer than the defeat of the enemy necessitates. According to the British Manual of Military Law, "illegitimate hostile acts by individuals who are not members of the armed forces" are "war crimes." The definition covers the activities of the resistance movements in various countries occupied by the German armies. Most of the movements were strongly supported by Britain. Dr Smith does not mention these specimens of the Allied violation of the rules and customs of war, but they and others inevitably come to mind as his book is being read. It is not too much to say that in the second war the winning side subordinated every moral scruple to the attainment of its victory.

As the new disregard for the law of nations has been most flagrant in the conduct of war, so, according to Dr Smith, it is in the midst of war that the obligations between nations at peace were first repudiated. The new Russian government of 1917 disclaimed the foreign debt of its Czarist predecessor. After 1919, all the way from the Polish annexation of Vilna in that year to the German invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1939, there was, Dr Smith says, "an almost unbroken crescendo of lawlessness" in the conduct of nation to nation.

I have said that the display of national immorality was worse in the second war of this century than in the first. The same is true of their aftermaths. Immediately the Germans had surrendered in 1945 territories were arbitrarily annexed without waiting for a peace treaty, and the annexations were ruthlessly enforced by the deportation, in conditions of the most callous cruelty, of millions of peaceful inhabitants. In addition, there were the trials at the hands of the victors of so-called "war criminals" among the vanquished. Here Dr Smith refers his readers to my own book on the subject,[1] and remarks himself:

> It is not disputed that the law under which the accused were charged was enacted, and enacted by the prosecuting powers themselves, long after the commission of many of the acts specified in the indictment, particularly the charge of waging and conspiring to wage aggressive war. Clearly there was here a violation of fundamental principle. Among "the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations" [to quote the Statute of the Permanent

[1] *Epitaph on Nuremberg* (1947).

Court of International Justice] none is more certain than the rule of *nulla poena sine lege*. . . .

The second fundamental principle which was violated was that of impartiality. . . . Not only was the Nuremberg tribunal manned exclusively by nationals of the victorious powers, but no attempt whatever was made to deal with war crimes, including the crime of aggression, committed on the allied side.

Finally Dr Smith points out that the Charter of the United Nations Organization, which was promulgated in 1945 to herald the inauguration of a new era of international law and order, adopts the principle that supreme power is above all law. The Charter expresses this principle, he says, in two ways, one positive, the other negative. Positively, it does so by vesting all power in the Supreme Council, and by providing that this power can be exercised by seven members, so long as the seven include the delegates of the Great Powers. Let such a majority be obtained—the Great Powers, that is to say, must be agreed—and the Charter imposes no limits on what the Council may do. Negatively, the Charter embodies the principle by means of the veto. Only a Great Power must consent to any action which the Council proposes to take against it. Other Powers, not great, are to do as the Council decides, willy-nilly. To come upon the doctrine voiced by Thrasymachus in the *Republic*, that "right" or "just" simply means the interest of the stronger, embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, is surely to be made to realize that there is a crisis in the attitude of the nations to moral principle. It is true that, as Pascal says in a celebrated passage, justice being open to dispute, but not force, justice could not be made strong, and so force has been made just. It is true that force is still force, even if it claims to be just. Nevertheless, in the universal acceptance by the end of the last century of the law of nations there was the intention that the use of force should always be restrained by a sense of fairness—that sense which led Frederick II to spare the Miller of Sans-Souci.

No doubt, to the thesis that a decline in national morality is visible in the new principles in the name of which nation deals with nation, it may be objected that the Great Powers have invariably behaved like the bully of the school, that in practice they have always agreed with Thrasymachus, and that their respect of international law has served to conceal their true predatory appetites. But even if power politics must by their nature be amoral, and even if power politics did not begin in 1901, there is still something new.

In the first war both belligerents and neutrals were anxious to show that international obligation had been respected. The most learned jurists and the most skilful advocates were entrusted with the task of demonstrating that there had been no violation of the law of nations. There was still a general desire for the support of morality. In the second war, as Dr Smith says, after 1940 scarcely any legal argument was invoked to justify whatever had been done. It was as if the national consciences had been extinguished. It was as if law and morality had ceased to matter. There lies the evidence of crisis. It is a new thing.

Likewise, at home before 1939 workmanship may sometimes have been slovenly, obedience to orders not invariably have been exacted, the ideal of manners have been often in abeyance, and the law have been on occasion exploited. The point is that it was then clearly recognized that such conduct was wrong. It is not recognized now. That too is new.

And the double novelty is surely disquieting.

Dostoievsky, in his novel *The Idiot*, speaking in the thin disguise of Prince Muishkin, recalls his Siberian experiences. Never while he was in prison in Siberia did he, he says, come upon even a most hardened and impenitent murderer who failed to know that he was a criminal; "that is to say, who was well aware that he had acted ill, even though he felt no remorse." But, on returning to St Petersburg, Dostoievsky heard of murderers who now pleaded that their crimes had been "natural." "There is the difference, in my opinion," Muishkin is made to say, "and it is an alarming difference."

In the realm of national morality today there is a same alarming difference.

Yet this alarming difference has provoked no outburst of indignation. No public figure in England has protested at the distortion of international law or at the provisions of the United Nations Charter. As for the devaluation of the word "English" at home, that too is witnessed in approximate silence. Mr Douglas Jerrold declared in one newspaper that we have now lost the sense of obligation, and in another somebody else remarked that as social morality—by which he meant health services and pensions—had gone up, so individual morality had gone down. But those are small solo voices. The men who pass for moral leaders are content to acquiesce.

In particular, there has been no sign from the clergy of the Church of England. Yet the nation's morality may well be thought of ecclesiastical concern. Indeed, where but in the Church can anything be done about it? You cannot refute Thrasymachus regarding the interest of the stronger unless, like Socrates, you believe in something above strength and force. Dr Smith concludes his important little book with the following words:

> The world cannot be saved except by a common faith. At this point it will be obvious that the mere lawyer has reached the limit of what he can usefully say.

Those concluding words are a call to churchmen.

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Right Rev. John Hind, D.D., was Bishop of Fukien from 1918 to 1940.

The Rev. Daniel Jenkins is on the staff of the Christian Frontier.

Mr Montgomery Belgion is the author of *Epitaph on Nuremberg*, etc.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE MEANING OF EXISTENCE. By Charles Duell Kean. Latimer House. 12s. 6d.

This is an American book by the Rector of Kirkwood, Missouri, printed in England for the English. One's first reaction is to wish that someone had provided an English translation. To give two examples: "Students of history are aware of the confluence of historical forces that develop issues of very wide dimensions" (p. 137); "The whole orientation (of the Incarnation) is different, and the doctrinal elements, which assert the primacy of intellectual formulations, are de-emphasized" (p. 149). One plods through this sort of thing to the end, and the author's jargon is matched by his irritating dogmatism and authoritative tone.

None the less the book is of great contemporary interest, despite the pain and grief of wrestling with it, for it is an original Christian existentialism, a first-fruits from the U.S.A. of the Princeton translations of Kierkegaard, an independent work from an unexpected quarter bearing all the marks of the standard European stock. These are: (1) The typical doctrine of a discontinuity and non-correspondence between the realm of thought and the realm of "existence"; between the sphere of the abstract and the universal (which are mental) and the sphere of the concrete particular event; between the ideals of ethics and the relativities of history; (2) the sharp distinction between relations to objects (which are objects of thought) and relations to persons (which are subjects); (3) a gospel of tragedy, anxiety and guilt; words all of which refer in various ways to men's inner reaction to this perpetual and intolerable tension from which they cannot escape; and (4) a doctrine of freedom which asserts that the only way in which a man can be liberated from the slavery of tragedy and anxiety is by *accepting* his situation with a deep assent of the whole personality, thus finding life worth while and "realizing freedom" in decisions of the will which can never be morally unambiguous.

No wonder, then, that Mr Kean is both dogmatic and obscure, quite apart from his Americanisms. For if the centre of existentialism is the view that the realm of existence and existential decision is beyond the range of the intellect, which can only "externalize," you can hardly argue it. In fact, at bottom all existentialists *preach*, and their preaching is unintelligible unless their hearers have already had some deep experience, to which appeal may be made, of the futility of Rationalism, the inadequacy of Naturalism, and the horrors of *die Angst*.

The author begins and ends with a reference to the "epochal crisis" of our time, when the conclusion of World War II is laying bare the fundamental insecurity of man's existence. What is to be our reaction to this crisis? Stripped of jargon the answer seems to be a choice between religions. The competitors of authentic existential Christianity [which include unauthentic Christianity, Marxism, and also

Capitalism, the "official religious faith of the United States" (p. 198)] all give illusory or inadequate answers to the problem of "fundamentally unrelieved tragedy and anxiety."

What is *existential* Christianity? Men live on three "levels" or have three "areas." History (*not* written history) is the level of causally related events, the level of stubborn "given" situations which necessitate action and prescribe limited choices. It is a category of experience to which moral discriminations are not proper (p. 64), a realm in which moral principles cannot be fully vindicated, but a realm where we nevertheless have moral responsibility. The intellect is the level on which we evaluate and transcend experience; we universalize, externalize and systematize the stream of events out of which we cannot step as historical existents. The level of existence is the level where historical circumstances and intellectual patterns are in contradiction with each other. It is a level of "dialectical tension," of "polarity," of "transcendence," where we are conscious of the "now" of decision dialectically related to fate and necessity, and of the "I—Thou" transcending the isolation of the intellect. It is the area in which we face the true "tragedy" of the perpetual contradiction between history and intellect with their concomitant ethical ambiguities, and recognize the "anxiety" which is connected with all attempts to escape our situation. Existence can only be interpreted in terms of *myth* (p. 113), which "provides by means of a story a dialectical frame of reference within which the historical and intellectual levels of experience remain in tension; but the opposition instead of being destructive becomes creative" (p. 115). Christianity, in the "myths" of the Cross and Resurrection, discloses to men the meaning of existence by revealing them to themselves as crucifiers and crucified; and by placing them in an "I—Thou" relationship to Jesus in the "now." They are "released" by accepting their situation as participants in the world's tragedy, involved in all its relativities. Fruitful tension replaces destructive warfare (p. 179). As we live concretely in the "now" and the "I—Thou," every decision becomes a recapitulation of the Cross and Resurrection (p. 189).

Certain questions immediately spring to mind. Can we distinguish history as the level of causally related events from history as a selection and interpretation by the human intellect? What *are* historical events, strictly speaking? Or again, we may ask in what sense Christianity as a "myth" story is *true* (the author is content to say that "myths" must neither be rationalized nor literalized). There is no anticipation and discussion of questions such as these and many more. Here is no tentative book, but one to be swallowed whole by those who can stomach it. Like all existentialist writings, broadly speaking it cannot be understood and rejected; it can only be regarded either as a sort of gospel or as utter nonsense. The reviewer for one cannot make up his mind.

Basil S. Moss.

Scholæ Cancellarii,
Lincoln.

Christian Apologetics. By Alan Richardson. S.C.M. Press. 10s. 6d.

"Nisi credideritis, non intelligetis" is Canon Richardson's title-page motto; it is the primary theme of his examination of the methods of Christian theology. The task of the apologist is, in the author's words, the clearing of the ground of weeds and the preparation of it for the seed of the Word; in a society the majority of whose members have been predisposed by a narrow and gravely limited education to reject all belief that cannot be empirically verified by the methods of the natural sciences every Christian must of necessity play the apologist's part. The difficulties encountered by such evangelistic methods as those outlined in the *Towards the Conversion of England* report are evidence enough that the crop of weeds is dense and deeply rooted; the apologist needs strong and efficient tools. This book will do much to furnish them.

Canon Richardson's first task is to reinstate theology in its proper place as an empirical science, working with its own independent categories on the data of "the faith, worship, and witness of the living Church." Probably the most successful achievement of modern theology has been the regaining of a firm hold on the concept of revelation, and one of the valuable features of this book is its clear exposition of the fact that Christianity is rooted in a revelation communicated through historical events interpreted by faith. "The Necessity of Faith" might well serve as an alternative title to this book, for the guiding principle here laid down for theology and history—and, in their degree, for the physical sciences as well—is the Augustinian doctrine that faith precedes reason, or, as the author expresses it, "Without believing there is no knowledge. . . . Man comes to the knowledge of the truth, not by the untrammelled exercise of his reasoning powers, but by accepting or being given the faith which enables him to use his reason aright." Reason must be guided by a principle of interpretation external to itself.

In the recognition of this truth, as Canon Richardson suggests, there lies the best hope that philosophy, at present so largely concerned with the problem of perception and the significance of words, and hardly able to perform its proper task as a guide to life, may emerge from its *impasse* and turn its attention to its central and traditional subject-matter. The principle it selects need not necessarily be Christian faith, but it must be *a* faith, and it is the further task of the apologist to demonstrate the unique power of his own belief to enable reason to discharge its proper function. Canon Richardson points the apologist's way by his sound treatment on Augustinian lines of the bearing of original sin on the validity of man's reasoning. The divine "image," though not lost, is so far defaced as to invalidate the conclusions of reason unilluminated by revelation and the response to it of faith. "Ideological" and "wishful" thinking passes itself off too easily as rational, once a Pelagian view of reason's competence gains currency—a truth which, it is claimed, both Marx and Freud have demonstrated negatively.

On this ground the author condemns the optimistic fallacy underlying the traditional conception of natural theology. On the other

hand, by adopting (with Dr John Baillie and other recent theologians) the preferable concepts of "general" and "special" revelation he successfully avoids falling into the opposite pitfall of Barthian irrationalism and acknowledges the divinely revealed character of all knowledge of truth, including the insights of non-Christian religions. This general revelation requires correction and transvaluation through God's special self-revelation, mediated through historical events interpreted in the light of principles implicit in the biblical record. That such an interpretation is rationally defensible is ably argued in the author's treatment of historical method. His severe strictures on the modern attempt to force historical thinking into the mould fashioned by the physical sciences will do much to remove current prejudices against the Christian approach to the biblical data. The assumption that history ought to aim at objective impartiality in the same degree as natural science is largely responsible for the fact that it is in the realm of history, rather than, as in the last century, in that of science, that the modern inquirer encounters the gravest difficulties in his attempt to understand the Christian viewpoint. The stress here laid upon the need for an "existential" approach to history is most valuable for the present-day apologist.

Canon Richardson is a biblical theologian. He insists that the Bible must be interpreted by the principles contained within itself, and he offers an interesting restatement of the ancient arguments from miracle and prophecy, though we may wonder whether the critical revolution does not set the modern believer further than he suggests from the standpoint of the early and medieval Christian.

The ordinary inquirer is perhaps more perplexed by the problem of the validity of non-Christian claims to revelation than this book indicates. They can, it is true, be comfortably fitted into the framework of "general" revelation, but it is scarcely true that in no case do they go further and demand consideration as "special" revelation, and the phenomenon they present may need fuller treatment. Some readers may think that the cursory dismissal of mystical experience, Christian and non-Christian (pp. 115, 243), does insufficient justice to a significant datum of theology.

This is, on the whole, a book which not only sums much that is good in recent theology, but stands in the traditional line of Hooker and classical Anglicanism. It well illustrates the great opportunity afforded to the Gospel in an age which is beginning to realize the bankruptcy of faithless reasoning. The character of the argument suggests that Anglicanism, if true to its tradition, is in an advantageous position to make full use of it.

G. W. H. Lampe.

St John's College,
Oxford.

The Parish Priest at Work. By Charles R. Forder. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

Much hard work must have been done to produce so comprehensive a survey of parochial organization, and it is all set forth with lucidity

and skill. But one reaches the end with the doubt whether any parish priest will alter the way he runs his parish as a result of reading it. The writer, in his introduction, makes clear that he is aware that the number to whom such a book will be of use is limited, and with humility admits that such a survey "must necessarily be somewhat conventional, and serve more as a guide-book or a reference-book."

But it may well prove of more use than this to any parish priest whom it leads to a consideration of the assumptions on which the book is planned. In the introduction it is said that for the purpose of the book "it must be assumed that all is well with the priest's own inner life," and further that "in order to describe ordinary pastoral work the effects of war have to be ignored." Is it possible to do either of these things and still leave any real content at the end?

"Neither the parish nor the world can be evangelized through an inefficient machine," we are told. But inefficient for what? Is the meaning of evangelization so self-evident and unanimously agreed among members of the Church that the idea of efficiency needs no further qualification? Surely it is just here that the real problem of the parish priest lies, which this book can do very little to answer. And it is here that the other assumption enters into the problem. It is perhaps one of the dangers of the moment that too many parish priests have got at the back of their minds an unrecognized hope that there is, just round the corner, a normal state of parish life which will return as soon as the disturbance of the war has settled down. Surely that is a vain dream. The days when there were enough priests to cover most of the necessary work, are gone for a long time, if not for ever. We are living in a world quite different from anything that we have known before, and to wait for the old ways to return is to blind ourselves to the demands of a very rapidly changing present.

In the countryside, where the size of parishes might still leave time for the parish priest really to cope with his task, it is becoming ever more necessary to put several parishes together. However necessary this may be, there can be no doubt that it makes it impossible for the man in charge to be a real parish priest to either or any of his charges. In the town, with the ever-growing scarcity of men, there is hardly a parish where it is physically possible for the available staff to do all that needs to be done if the parish is to become a living community. What the parish priest needs to-day, if indeed anything can be of any use to him but "his own inner life," is some guide concerning the relative importance of the many calls upon his time. What calls is he to put aside in order that his files may be up to date? How far is he right to reject all diocesan claims upon his time, and to pray for the sick and sinners in his own cure? Is he to risk his own health by sacrificing his day off to meet the urgent needs of one of his own flock? These are the sort of problems that from hour to hour beset every parish priest who has a conscience and a love for the folk committed to his care. While all the time he knows that the future is uncharted and that the old order will never return, and all he does must be done in the light of that fact. If the parish priest has not already faced these issues for himself and found some sort of answer,

it is doubtful whether this book will help him; grateful though we may be for its skilful summary of parish organization.

St Michael's Vicarage, Wigan. A. M. Whitehead.

Ulrich Zwingli. Vol. 2: Seine Entwicklung zum Reformator, 1506-1520. Edited by Oscar Farner. Zwingli Verlag, Zurich. Fr. 14.00.

Students of the Reformation may be grateful that the war years did not prevent the Zwingli Press in Zurich from going ahead with one of the most beautiful editions ever published in a series of volumes of Zwingli's works. Six volumes, a joy to handle and possess, have already appeared. One of the chief editors is Prof. Oscar Farner, one of the foremost Zwingli scholars, the first volume of whose life of Zwingli (Vol. 1: His youth, and years as scholar and student) appeared in 1943. Now we have the second volume: like the first, a model of book production, and of which the blurb "richly illustrated" is for once an understatement. The result is that, as never before, we are in a position to assess Zwingli's inner developments and weigh his own words, and we may hope that eventually enough of them may percolate into the English theological arena to ensure that, as with Luther, some recent sweeping generalizations may be reconsidered.

Most people know of Zwingli as a humanist, and yet it is almost as important to remember what is clearly shown here—that he was a very typical army chaplain, if not indeed a positive fire-eater, who valued his "pep talk" capacities as highly as his cure of perishing souls. (There may have been a lifelong tension between the patriotic Swiss who had himself worn armour and fought, and was to die on the battlefield, and the Erasmian pacifism of the 1510-20's.) We see him as a student engrossed in all the Erasmian excitement of the German-Swiss humanists, so that an admirer could address him as "Priest of the Muses and of Christ."

There is an interesting and informative chapter on his first acquaintance with the teaching of Luther, and Dr Farner joins the late Walther Köhler in agreeing that Zwingli had indeed, as he claimed, made his own independent theological discoveries in the Scripture before he heard of Luther, and probably before 1516. And yet his theological development is surely not faintly comparable in richness with that of Luther's during this period? We see Zwingli as the Abbot's chaplain at Einsiedeln, copying out St Paul's epistles in eagerness to study them in the Greek, but with 200 references to Origen on Romans for three from Augustine. (Not until 1519 had Augustine become dominant and magisterial for Zwingli.) We have that pitiful letter in which Zwingli has to confess his own moral lapses, which yet did not disqualify him from the all-important appointment to his church in Zurich. We have a Zwingli like many other humanists, who draws back from the gathering storm—there is the significant fact that of all Zwingli's books his copies of Luther's works have no marginal notes

by Zwingli. But if that was a phase of caution, we also find Zwingli moving towards the time when, himself a papal pensioner, he must face the consequences of open revolt, and the work ends with a warrior preparing himself for war, affirming "as the Church found its life only through blood, so will it be renewed only through blood and in no other way."

Gordon Rupp.

Richmond,
Surrey.

Das Leiden des Unschuldigen in Babylon und Israel. By Johann Jakob Stamm. Zwingli Verlag, Zurich. Fr. 5.50.

The Old Testament, according to Dr Stamm, distinguishes three types of suffering:

(1) The suffering of the innocent (*e.g.*, Job).
(2) Representative suffering (*e.g.*, the Servant of Is. liii).
(3) Exemplary suffering (*e.g.*, Jeremiah).

Only the first of these types finds a complete parallel in Babylonian religious literature, of which three documents are examined:

(1) A dialogue between a master and slave.
(2) A dialogue between a sufferer and his devout friend.
(3) A psalm of complaint and thanksgiving.

Dr Stamm concludes that the only point of contact between the two religions, despite the close parallels, is that of a common origin in what he calls "common oriental wisdom," with its naïve belief that good is always rewarded and evil punished. Starting from the same premises and faced with the same hard realities of life, both religions wrestle with the problem of the prosperity of the wicked and the suffering of the righteous. But their answers are wholly different. The Babylonian either surrenders to scepticism, or falls back on a restatement of his naïve "wisdom faith." For the Hebrew sufferer, on the other hand, there is a third factor in the problem, namely the impact of a personal Creator-God, who has chosen Israel and entered into a covenant relation with it. Such is the God who, by speaking out of the whirlwind to Job, gives a unique turn to the problem of suffering, quite unknown to Babylonian speculation.

The second and third types of suffering are not represented in the Babylonian documents, for the simple reason that they arise only in the context of revelation. The nearest approach to representative suffering in Babylonian religion is that of magical transference. Genuine representative suffering is possible only as a free response to the command of a personal God. Exemplary suffering—the suffering of a prophet incurred in the delivery of the divine word—is equally unknown in Babylon, for it knew no prophetic word which interpreted the historical process.

This is an interesting example of the use which is being made to-day on the Continent of the comparative study of religions. But after reading Dr Stamm's excellent translations of the three Babylonian documents, one cannot help wondering whether he has not overstated

his case. A common origin in a remote past seems an insufficient explanation of the remarkable close parallels in the two religions. After all, the religion of Israel did not exist in an intellectual vacuum, any more than the strictest revelational theology does to-day.

EDGBASTON. R. H. FULLER.

THE REGISTER OF HENRY CHICHELE, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, 1414-1443. Volume IV. Edited by E. F. Jacob. Clarendon Press, Oxford. 21s.

With the issue of this fourth volume, Dr E. F. Jacob's invaluable edition of the Register of Archbishop Chichele reaches its conclusion; and both editor and publisher have placed students of church history deeply in their debt by this provision on the grand scale of an indispensable source for the understanding of later medieval English history. Beginning in 1938 with Volume II, containing the wills proved before the archbishop and his commissaries and prefaced by a detailed analysis of the procedure followed in probate and of the contents of the wills, the series was continued in 1943 by the publication of Volume I, of which the outstanding feature was the sustained and erudite excursus on archiepiscopal administration in all its aspects as illustrated in the Register by the editor, the 172 pages of which are a miracle of compression and of lucid exposition. This volume contained also bulls of provision and other documents relating to the appointment of the higher clergy and the institutions and exchanges of benefices in the diocese of Canterbury and in vacant sees. In 1945 there followed Volume III, which was especially valuable for its record of the minutes of the Provincial Convocation, a mine of information for students of the provincial synods of the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, and including also the registers of vacant sees and documents relating to archiepiscopal visitations. Now the process reaches its completion with Volume IV, containing commissions, letters, royal writs and, what is especially valuable, the lists of ordinations for the primate's own diocese, and for other sees either during metropolitical visitation or during the vacancy of the see.

With the fulfilment of this great task, it is possible to appreciate even more clearly the immense nature of the labour involved, the importance of the synoptic survey given in the introduction to Volume I, and the rich and varied materials uncovered for the history of the church in England in the middle of the fifteenth century. Within the compass of a brief review it is not possible to expatiate on details; but it must suffice to say that Dr Jacob has placed all students of English church history in the later Middle Ages under a debt whose magnitude can only be realized by careful and detailed use of the indices to the several volumes. Alike by his own magisterial introductory essays and by the fullness of evidence assembled, this edition of Archbishop Chichele's Register is a mine of information and instruction. It is safe to say that All Souls' College could have devised no worthier nor more enduring commemoration of the quincentenary of its foundation, nor offered a greater contribution to learning, than

by their publication of these volumes. And with the gratitude of all students to the college will be associated their especial tribute of thanks to the editor.

NORMAN SYKES.

CAMBRIDGE.

NEWMAN AND BLOXAM: AN OXFORD FRIENDSHIP. By R. D. Middleton. Oxford University Press. 18s.

Mr Middleton is well known for his useful studies of the Magdalen Tractarians, as well as for his book on Dr Routh. He is also probably the best modern Anglican student of Newman, although this is his first full-length work on the subject.

It might be supposed that the ground of Newman's life had already been so fully investigated that there was nothing new to be said about it. Mr Middleton, however, does give us much that is new by printing a number of letters which, although known to exist, have not before been published. Thus, while our general picture of Newman remains unchanged, a study of this book does serve to underline certain aspects of his career and character. No future student of Newman will be able to neglect it. The study of Bloxam, described, I think by Lord Blachford, as "the father and grandfather of all ritualists," is an attractive supplement to the same author's essay on him in *Magdalen Studies*.

Bloxam became Newman's curate at Littlemore in 1836, and their friendship, surviving the cataclysm of 1845, remained intimate until Newman's death in 1890. In about 1882 Bloxam began collecting manuscript material concerning his friend, and it is this material, consisting mainly of manuscript letters and Bloxam's notes, which forms the basis of Mr Middleton's study. The material in Bloxam's scrap-books is supplemented from letters at the Birmingham Oratory, the Bloxam-Rigaud correspondence in the Bodleian Library, and elsewhere. An important chapter is compiled from a further manuscript collection of Bloxam's, preserved at Magdalen College and lettered *Reunion: Ambrose Lisle Phillipps*.

The bulk of the book is naturally concerned with the ten years from 1836, when the new church at Littlemore was consecrated and Bloxam became its first curate, and 1845, when Newman submitted to Rome. For the ensuing forty-five years the friendship lived chiefly on memory, though a regular correspondence was maintained and the two friends met from time to time.

The chapter entitled "Letters on Reunion" is extraordinarily interesting and instructive and throws a flood of light on the curious atmosphere of the times. It was Ambrose de Lisle (to use the name by which he is best known) who pressed the matter throughout; Bloxam, to whom the letters were addressed, was cautious, while Newman was definitely suspicious. Some of de Lisle's notions about the state of Anglicanism are incredibly naïve, and he was, as Mr Middleton rightly points out, living in a world of make-believe. The affair was not helped by the fact that several of de Lisle's Anglican friends were threatening to go over to Rome unless they saw "a good

prospect of the reunion of the Church of England with the Latin Church." Finally, the secession of one of them, R. W. Sibthorpe, caused Bloxam to withdraw from the correspondence. The important light which this chapter throws upon the relations of the Tractarians to Roman Catholicism might perhaps have merited its separate publication as a monograph, amplified by a fuller selection from the correspondence than space has permitted here.

Henry R. T. Brandreth, O.G.S.

Northolt Park.

Letters to Young Churches: A Translation of the New Testament Epistles. By J. B. Phillips. Geoffrey Bles. 10s. 6d.

This is a very attractive book, and yet one which one hesitates to recommend. It is attractive for several reasons. First, because any attempt to convey to a modern reader the sparkle and "modernity" of the Epistles is worth making. Secondly, because the writer, as his fascinating preface shows, is fired by a real experience: he has been "found" by the New Testament, and in the course of his work "felt rather like an electrician re-wiring an ancient house without being able to 'turn the mains off.'" Thirdly, there is Mr C. S. Lewis's incisive introduction, exploding certain misconceptions about St Paul and talking interestingly about New Testament language. Last, but not least, the translator or paraphrast has now and then managed to bring off something at once new and true—a turn of phrase which is really fresh without being unfaithful to its original. It is not at all bad to meet an Apostle as a "Special Messenger" of God, or to find that the Dispersion means "Displaced Tribes," or that Jesus "came to earth with the express purpose of liquidating the devil's activities." There is something authentic as well as topical there; and the same might be said of a phrase like "a façade of 'religion.'" On occasion, too, the writer has obviously taken great pains really to face a notoriously difficult clause: 2 Thess. i, 11 is an instance, with the prayer "that He will effect in you all that His goodness desires to do, and that your faith makes possible." Or again, we are at least not left guessing by this in Philemon: "And I pray that those who share your faith may also share your knowledge of all the good things that believing in Jesus Christ can mean to us." And here, from James, is a specimen of deft paraphrasing: "The brother who is poor may be glad because God has called him to the true riches. The rich may be glad that God has shown him his spiritual poverty." In the same epistle the perplexing "wheel of nature" becomes just "the whole of life." In 1 Peter iii, 21, that notorious *crux*, " he answer of a good conscience . . ." is rendered by "the ability to face God with a clear conscience."

Yet, whatever its merits, it is difficult to feel confident about this book. The scholarship behind it gives the impression of being rather patchy. The little introductions at the head of each epistle are, although "fundamentalism" is expressly repudiated, misleadingly complacent. "*A few scholars* (we are told) do not accept the Pauline

authorship" of the Pastorals; the author of the Epistle of James was "almost certainly" the Lord's brother or step-brother; and (to close the wall round a fools' paradise) 2 Peter is "the only letter of the New Testament whose authenticity has been disputed." The paraphrasing instinct sometimes runs away with the writer. One meets examples of getting more out of the Greek than it will yield, such as: "make it your ambition to have no ambition!" (1 Thess. iv); and "all . . . who have made evil their play-fellow" (2 Thess. ii, 12). Sometimes he has almost certainly blundered outright. Whatever is the meaning of the difficult "justified by the Spirit . . ." (1 Tim. iii, 16), it can hardly be that Jesus "met . . . every demand of the Spirit in the sight of angels as well as of men"; or again, "those who have loved what they have seen of Him" (2 Tim. iv, 8) is manifestly wrong for "those who love His appearing."

Doubtless the writer would be the first to emphasize that the work is meant for the present moment, and is to be expected to "date": that, indeed, is part of its value. But even so it could be improved in many details without losing any of its "bite" and relevance. Would it be impertinent to plead in all seriousness that this wholly admirable experiment should be carried a step further by a thoroughly revised edition on the same lines?

C. F. D. Moule.

Cambridge.

An Introduction to Jesus for the Twentieth Century. By R. W. Stewart. James Clarke. 6s.

The Good News. By H. F. Wickings. Lutterworth Press. 7s. 6d.

The only remarkable thing about the first of these two books is its date. To have read "first published 1907" instead of "first published 1947" would have caused no surprise. The author is in full cry after that elusive figure, the historical Jesus. He claims to differ from his predecessors in that quest by placing his Jesus on the background of a "new philosophical outlook." He places great emphasis on contingency in human life, and according to this theory Jesus fits naturally into the existing historical process. There is therefore no need to suppose that the Incarnation is a divine invasion of history, or that history itself is divinely controlled. The Jesus of this book is not therefore the Incarnate Lord of traditional faith and theology. It is not possible in any real sense to say that He is divine. The traditional beliefs about His birth and Resurrection are embellishments of the story, not historical facts. His career can be explained as that of a man endowed with special gifts. His death was no more than a source of inspiration to His followers.

All this is familiar to us. But this book fails to supply any reasonable evidence for its thesis. Mr Stewart's method of biblical inquiry is to select parts of the gospels for use and to ignore others, without justifying his choice. He constructs a "simple" story out of the gospels, unencumbered by any of the real problems, and into this he reads the familiar liberal interpretation of the "development" of our Lord's career. On the basis of one saying of our Lord about John the Baptist

he concludes that Jesus "hero-worshipped" John. He empties such words as "covenant" and "sacrifice" of their meaning without any better reason than that they *can* be given simpler meanings. "This is the new covenant in my blood" suggests to most students a reference to the Mosaic covenant simply by the presence of the words "covenant" and "blood" in the same phrase. To Mr Stewart "covenant" merely means "grace of God," and "blood" merely refers vaguely to the fact that it was connected with the death of Jesus.

This is typical of the exegesis on which this book is based. Most of the statements about the life of Jesus are without any precise reference to the gospels. Themes like "judgement," "resurrection" and the relation of the Father to the Son are ignored. If this book is taken seriously by the uninformed inquiring reader, it will provide him with an introduction to a Jesus, but not to the Jesus we know.

The Good News, whose purpose is much the same—to give a clear account to the intelligent inquirer of the meaning of Jesus Christ—succeeds very much better because it has no particular theories to put forward. It is a "harmony" of selected passages from the gospels in a modern translation, with explanatory notes. Whether it is desirable to introduce people to the gospels in this particular way—which may unconsciously suggest that the arrangement of the gospels themselves can be improved upon, and risks losing something of the intrinsic value of the incidents by emphasizing their chronology—is a debatable point. But the job is well done. The translation is competent, the selection and arrangement acceptable, and the notes provide useful information and clear and orthodox exposition.

BASINGSTOKE. R. N. WHYBRAY.

DOCTOR JOHNSON'S PRAYERS. Edited by Elton Trueblood. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

A month before his death in 1784 Dr Johnson, finding himself unable to fulfil an undertaking then lately given to Dr Adams that he would produce a volume of family prayers, handed over to the Rev. George Strahan (1744-1824), his constant visitor and the son of his publisher, a number of papers containing his own private prayers and some highly personal memoranda about his endeavours and resolutions at the time of their composition. Strahan decided that it was right to publish the whole collection, which thus became of use to Boswell and others. The error, if it was an error, has upon the whole proved a blessing. The vast majority of those who are likely to look into the so-called *Prayers and Meditations* must find this self-revelation of a devout mind, as Johnson found William Law, "quite an overmatch for" them. Those to whom their writer is at once the giant who bestrode "Johnson's England" like a Colossus and the warmest of friends, the sturdy satirist of *London* and the tender elegiast of Mr Robert Levett, will be humbly grateful for admission to the sanctuary of a soul kept far more white than its own humility realized. There is something profoundly touching and encouraging about the homely background of Johnson's prayers.

The present edition, which contains the prayers without the memoranda, is, however, surely nearer to Johnson's intention than was Strahan's publication. It is beautifully produced; the prayers are classified under various heads, and a grave and comprehensive introduction places the compositions within the setting of Johnson's convictions and practice. Understood in their context, they are impressive. It seems that Johnson, who could lightly toss off brilliant essays for the press, spent great pains in polishing these apparently simple utterances; after which, having done his best with them, he would offer them several times at the Throne of Grace. They contain little variety and are limited in scope; no fewer than 31 of the 100 forms have the petition, "Take not Thy Holy Spirit from me." And when a specific request is made for a friend, whether departed or living, it is accompanied by some such qualification as "if I may presume to ask." The sober temper of the prayers, in fact, closely corresponds to the principles expressed by Johnson in the conclusion of *The Vanity of Human Wishes*, though with one striking addition—the solemn recurrence to the mystery of redemption. If there is little of expressed adoration or of mysticism, there is sound ascetic theology, at least for students and literary people; and the sincerity, the manliness and the reverence compel respect. Seekers for forms for private or informal use will find sound things here. Might it not be well if some informal services began, not with the Collect for Purity, diverted from its customary English use at the Eucharist, but with Johnson's Introductory Prayer?

BRECON. EDWARD SWANSEA AND BRECON.

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE. By Florence Higham. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

Octavia Hill, Miss Higham records, guaranteed that she would make any careful reader understand Maurice's writings in three-quarters of an hour; but then she had met Maurice and heard him answering her sick sister's "unanswered questions unconsciously asked, so that they answered those deep down in us." Without this personal acquaintance we need longer to comprehend, but Miss Higham's readable little book should help people to find those deep answers Maurice's books have to offer. For Maurice's faith undoubtedly was all of a piece with his life, with his Unitarian upbringing, with his finding his place as a firmly anti-partisan member of the Church of England in her most partisan days, with his work with the sick and poor and ill-educated, yet the work always of a theologian. His life is fascinating, even dramatic, but the drama is on a theological theme, and so tends to offer rather static material for a popular biographer. It is dramatic in the manner of the fourth Gospel rather than the second.

Miss Higham has us thoroughly absorbed in her well-drawn pictures of the loves, physical and theological, of the Maurice household, of Maurice pondering decisively over Pusey's tract on baptism on a stile between Guy's and Clapham, of the strangely assorted men building

a Christian sociology over tea-cups at Queen's Square, of the youthful Hort writing a pregnant letter to Maurice asking him to explain the word "eternity." There the pictures rather fail, though there is drama enough in the story of Maurice's dismissal from King's and of his controversy with Mansel, but perhaps their drama can only be appreciated in a more theological study. Just here we hope Miss Higham will stir many readers to begin their own theological study of Maurice, or to continue it with increased knowledge until they have read from *The Kingdom of Christ* through the major works to the *Life and Letters*. There they will find the faith that takes God so seriously as to brand most of us almost as atheists, that takes the Church so seriously as to convict the Romanists of being "low church," and that takes the world so seriously that it has answered many of the questions raised by secularism since Maurice's day.

CAMBERWELL. J. H. CHURCHILL.

SHORTER NOTICES

Essays Presented to Charles Williams. Oxford University Press. 12s. 6d.

Miss Dorothy Sayers is no more to be suspected of having wished to patronize Dante than Mr Lewis of having wanted to check the growing reputation of the late Charles Williams. Yet for him to imply that Williams was interested in the topics dealt with by the contributors to this volume is surely as misleading as for her to pretend that *The Divine Comedy* is a jolly story of adventure. A hotch-potch, Mr Lewis says, "is an excellent dish; consult the *Noctes Ambrosianæ*." He could not proclaim his misjudgment more clearly. You do not discover the excellence of a dish in books, but in your mouth (and from the ensuing eupepsia). As Fowler says in his *Modern English Usage*, "you can only pronounce a thing excellent on trial." What Williams would have thought privately of this particular hotch-potch we shall never know. But we can guess. Fortunately the memoir with which Mr Lewis introduces it must make difficult the belief that the shimmering dance of Williams's mind would have fallen into step with such ponderous gambols. Yet, before writing one or two sentences of that memoir, Mr Lewis might have asked himself if they would not wound family susceptibilities. In any event, not on what the man was, for he has gone, but on what is left, his own writings, can the reputation of Williams be expected to subsist. M. B.

Evangelism and Education: The Presentation of Religion to Adults. By T. E. Jessop. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

It is not uncommon, when the subject of Evangelism is under discussion, to hear the somewhat disheartened comment—"Well, we've lost the older generation: the only thing to do is to concentrate on the children." Could any strategy be more short-sighted? Ask any member of the teaching profession: consider the damning figures of lapsed confirmation candidates. The evidence all points in the same direction.

Against the indifference or hostility of the home, the effects of school and Church are in most cases of little avail.

Nor is the premiss on which the inference depends necessarily true. This book goes some way to disprove it. Professor Jessop, basing his argument on an unrivalled experience of presenting religion to men in the Forces, claims that while they may be largely immune against the appeal of preaching or evangelistic propaganda, they will frequently respond with real alacrity to a well-instructed *teaching* technique. Such an approach is effective because it understands not only the subject to be presented, but, equally important, the mental attitude of those to be interested, and above all the characteristics of an *adult* approach to learning.

This small book is worth its weight in gold. It lays bare with relentless insight the mental sickness of a democracy which has allowed itself to be hoodwinked and exploited. It brings to bear the resources of sound psychological knowledge upon the conditions necessary for the teaching of adults. It opens up the wealth of material at our disposal in the field of "religious" teaching, properly understood. It gives admirably clear, and obviously well tested, advice on method and organization.

It is greatly to be desired that this book should come into the hands of every parish priest. It is even more to be desired that it should be put there by a group of his parishioners who, having read it, are determined that he and they together are going to do something about it.

ARTHUR BRISTOL.

Christian Obedience in Post-War Britain. British Citizens in World Affairs. Persons in the Modern World. Christian Obedience in the University. S.C.M. Press. 9d. each.

These four study syllabuses were prepared for the Westminster S.C.M. Conference. It is evident that a great deal of careful and well-informed work was put into their preparation. They should not only have served their original purpose very well, but also be useful to other study groups. Indeed, they can be recommended also for private reading and reflection.

The Order of Deaconesses. With a Foreword by the Bishop of Durham. Press and Publications Board. 1s. 6d.

This is a concise and convenient summary of the history of the Order of Deaconesses, of its revival in the Church of England, and of the regulations at present governing it in various provinces of the Anglican Communion.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher